REMARKS

This responds to the Office Action mailed on May 11, 2009. Reconsideration and continued examination is respectfully requested in view of the following remarks.

Status of Claims

Claims 27-32 are pending in the instant application. In particular, claims 27-39 have been rejected based on prior art, while claims 1-26 have been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer.

§103 Rejection of the Claims

Claims 27-29 and 31-32 remain rejected and claims 33-36, 38 and 39 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kim et al. (U.S. Patent No. 7,356,530) in view of Holland et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,507,867), while claim 30 remains rejected and claim 37 is rejected as being unpatentable over Kim and Holland and in further view of Jeffrey. The Applicant respectfully traverses the above rejections. Applicants respectfully submit that the Office Action did not make out a *prima facie* case of obviousness in connection with any of the rejections because even if combined, the cited reference fail to teach or suggest all of the elements of the Applicant's claimed invention as presently amended. The references must teach or suggest all the claim elements.[1]

With respect to independent claim 27, the Examiner asserts that Kim discloses "a system for converting interactive Internet content to a form suitable for distribution to clients with a limited or non-existent return channel while preserving the interactivity of the content, the system comprising: means for selecting and partitioning one or more pages of interactive content…a Page URL data structure storing data for use in identifying pages of interactive content…a Page Partition data structure storing data for use in tracking partitions that make up a page of interactive content…a Partition Link data structure storing data for use in tracking navigation data contained in a partition."[2]

Although the Examiner admits that Kim fails to specifically disclose a "means for integrating data stored in the Page URL, Page Partition, and Partition Link data structures and

---

[1] M.P.E.P. §2142 (citing *In re Vaeck*, 947 F.2d 488, 20 USPQ2d 1438 (Fed. Cir. 1991))
[2] *See* Office Action at Page 3.

partitions into a bundle; and means for distributing the bundle to a client device, the Examiner contends that Holland discloses "means for integrating data stored in the Page URL, Page Partition, and Partition Link data structures and partitions into a bundle…means for distributing the bundle to a client device", the Examiner concludes that "it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined Holland with Kim, since it would have allowed for efficient transfer of page components into a single packet."[3]

Independent claim 27 as presently amended recites, in part, a "system for converting interactive Internet content to a form suitable for distribution to clients with a limited or non-existent return channel while preserving the interactivity of the content, the system comprising a storage media including program code and a plurality of data structures, … and a processor to execute the program code to enable the system to select and partition *__a single page__* of the interactive Internet content into the plurality of partitions, to integrate data stored in the Page URL, Page Partition, and Partition Link data structures and partitions into a bundle, and to distribute the bundle to a client device." [4]

Kim relates to a "technique by which multiple Web pages can be dynamically bundled and downloaded for accessing on a user's workstation, [thereby] enabling the user to perform a meaningful transaction even in the absence of an ongoing network connection."[5] In one embodiment, a "search engine 10…includes a crawler 12 to fetch pages from the Web 13…The crawler 12 stores the fetched pages in a Web page database 14, which includes data structures optimized for fast access of the fetches pages…"[6] However, Kim fails to teach or suggest partitioning a single page into a plurality of partitions since the reference can only partition a particular page into a single partition and not a plurality of partitions as presently claimed by the Applicant. Similarly, Holland and Jeffrey also fail to teach or suggest partitioning a single page into a plurality of partitions.

Based on the foregoing, a prima facie case of obviousness cannot be established by the Examiner since the cited art does not teach or suggest every claim element of independent claim 27. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw his rejection of

---

[3] *See* Office Action at Pages 3-4.
[4] Emphasis Added.
[5] *See* Abstract.
[6] *See* Col. 4, lines 30-44.

independent claim 27 and indicate the allowance thereof. Similarly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw his rejection of independent claim 34, which has been amended to incorporate the same claim limitation of partitioning a single page into a plurality of partitions, and is allowable for the same reasons as independent claim 27. In addition, the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the rejections of dependent claims 28-33 and 35-39 by virtue of their respective dependencies from independent claims 27 and 34 and indicate the allowance thereof.

CONCLUSION

Applicant respectfully submits that the claims are in condition for allowance, and notification to that effect is earnestly requested. The Examiner is invited to telephone Applicant's representative at (314) 552-6855 to facilitate prosecution of this application.

If necessary, please charge any additional fees or credit overpayment to Deposit Account No. 50-1662.

Respectfully submitted,

POLSINELLI SHUGHART PC

Date: July 24, 2009   /Ari M. Bai/

Ari M. Bai, Reg. No. 38,726
100 South Fourth Street, Suite 1100
St. Louis, Missouri 63102-1825
Telephone: (314) 552-6855
Fax: (314) 231-1776
Email: abai@polsinelli.com
Attorney for Applicant

423536.2